

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 - 5 are pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the interview conducted on October 26, 2007. During the interview, the Examiner and Applicant's attorney discussed the outstanding rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph with respect to independent Claim 1. The Examiner and Applicant's attorney agreed that the claim amendments discussed below overcome the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Applicant failed to clearly set forth the intended boundaries of the claimed initial and surplus volumes of the optical element material. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite "providing an optical element material comprising an initial volume of the optical element material and a surplus volume of the optical element material inside the cylindrical holder material."

Therefore the optical element material includes both the initial volume and the excess volume of optical element material in aggregate.

Applicant has further amended Claim 1 to recite, “wherein the deformable portion is configured to receive a second volume of optical element material that is equivalent in volume to the surplus volume of the optical element material so that the optical element contains a first volume of optical element material that is equivalent in volume to the initial volume of the optical element material.” Applicant submits that the second volume of the optical element material received by the deformable portion represents a volume of optical element material that is not used to form the optical element. As such, the second volume of the optical element material is equivalent in volume to an additional or surplus volume as called for by Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

#### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Otsuki (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0184919A1). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In order to more fully distinguish Applicant’s invention in light of the Examiner’s comments, independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite in-part a method of manufacturing a holder-mounted optical element that includes, “applying a pressing force to the optical element material to cause the optical element material to expand outwardly in **a convex shape** and deform the deformable portion.” This subject matter is depicted in the specification as filed, particularly with reference to Figure 1. At a

minimum, Otsuki fails to disclose or suggest causing an optical element material to expand outwardly in a convex shape. In fact, Otsuki teaches away from the method recited in independent Claim 1. Specifically, Otsuki teaches expanding a metal ring 10 outward in a circumferential direction to define a final outside size as illustrated in Figures 1A and 1B. (P. 4, Para. 0054). As such, Otsuki fails to provide the advantages taught by the present invention. Particularly, the method recited by independent Claim 1 enables processing of the optical element material in a manner in which an error of the holder is reduced. Otsuki fails to recognize and/or remedy this problem. As a result, Otsuki fails to anticipate Claim 1 of the present invention.

Because Hsu et al. and Sasaki et al. each does not disclose the limitation of “applying a pressing force to the optical element material to cause the optical element material to expand outwardly in a convex shape”, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections against independent Claim 1 and its dependent claims be removed.

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gustavo Siller, Jr./  
Gustavo Siller, Jr.  
Registration No. 32,305  
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, IL 60610  
(312) 321-4200